

REMARKS

In the non-final Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 10-12 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over ANDERSSON et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,023,846) in view of ERIMLI (U.S. Patent No. 7,079,533). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.¹ Claims 10-12 and 17-20 remain pending.

Independent claim 10 is directed to a method of configuring a networking device. The method includes generating a first forwarding table; generating a second forwarding table; programming a filter to perform a lookup operation in the first forwarding table if a first field value of a received packet meets one or more conditions of a first set of conditions; and programming the filter to initiate a lookup operation in the second forwarding table if the first field value does not meet one or more conditions of the first set of conditions. ANDERSSON et al. and ERIMLI, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, ANDERSSON et al. and ERIMLI do not disclose or suggest programming a filter to perform a lookup operation in a first forwarding table if a first field value of a received packet meets one or more conditions of a first set of conditions and programming the filter to initiate a lookup operation in a second forwarding table if the first field value does not meet one or more conditions of the first set of conditions, as recited in claim 10. The Examiner admits that ANDERSSON et al. does not disclose these features (Office Action, pg. 3). To remedy this deficiency, the Examiner relies on

¹ As Applicants' remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicants' silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, motivation to combine reference, assertions as to dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicants that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicants reserve the right to analyze and dispute such assertions/requirements in the future.

Fig. 4 and column 7, line 61 – column 9, line 15 (which describes Fig. 4) of ERIMLI for allegedly disclosing the above features of claim 10 (Office Action, pg. 4). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of ERIMLI.

At column 7, line 61 – column 9, line 15, ERIMLI discloses determining frame forwarding information for a data frame received by a multiport switch. After receiving a data frame, a port filter determines whether there is forwarding information corresponding to the data frame in a lookup table of the port filter memory (column 8, lines 22-24). When the lookup table of the port filter memory stores frame forwarding information relating to the data frame, the port filter may mask data frame transferal to an external memory so the internal rules checker (IRC) ignores the data frame being transferred (column 8, lines 34-48). When the lookup table of the memory stores no frame forwarding information relating to the data frame, the port filter does nothing to mask the transferal of the data frame to the external memory (column 9, lines 4-8). This section of ERIMLI discloses masking or hiding data transferal when information relating to the data is stored in a table and not masking data transferal when information relating to the data is not stored in the table. This section of ERIMLI does not relate to forwarding tables at all, let alone first and second forwarding tables. Additionally, this section of ERIMLI does not disclose or suggest performing a lookup operation in one of the first or second forwarding tables based on a set of conditions. Rather, ERIMLI merely discloses examining a table for forwarding information relating to a received frame and hiding the transferal of the frame if it is determined that matching information is in the table. This section of ERIMLI in no way discloses or remotely suggests programming a filter to perform a lookup operation in a first forwarding table if a first

field value of a received packet meets one or more conditions of a first set of conditions and programming the filter to initiate a lookup operation in a second forwarding table if the first field value does not meet one or more conditions of the first set of conditions, as recited in claim 10.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit the claim 10 is patentable over ANDERSSON et al. and ERIMLI, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 10. Therefore, these claims are patentable over ANDERSSON et al. and ERIMLI, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 10.

Independent claim 17 recites features similar to (yet possibly of different scope than) features described above with respect to claim 10. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 17 is patentable over ANDERSSON et al. and ERIMLI, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to reasons given above with respect to claim 10.

Claims 18-20 depend from claim 17. Therefore, these claims are patentable over ANDERSSON et al. and ERIMLI, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 17.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

While the present application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, should the Examiner find some issue to remain unresolved, or should any new issues arise which could be eliminated through discussions with Applicants' representative, then the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to expedite prosecution of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY SNYDER, L.L.P.

By: /Meagan S. Walling, Reg. No. 60112/
Meagan S. Walling
Registration No. 60,112

Date: October 29, 2007
11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800

Customer Number: 44987